

17410-00010 PATENT Sh

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Mark Anthony Juneau

Art Unit: 2125

Serial No.: 09/833,823

Examiner: Carlos R. Ortiz Rodriguez

Filed: April 12, 2001

•

For:

METHODS AND SYSTEMS

FOR THE EVALUATION OF POWER GENERATING

FACILITIES

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL

1. Transmitted herewith is:
Transmittal (3 pgs., in duplicate); Amendment in response to Office Action dated
September 21, 2005 (2 pgs.); Return post card

STATUS

2. Applicant

claims small entity status. is other than a small entity.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Express Mail Label No.: EV593385123US

Date: October 20, 2005

I hereby certify that the documents listed above are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.10 on the date indicated above in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Daniel M. Fitzgerald, Reg. No. 38,880

EXTENSION OF TERM

	3. The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.136 apply.						
	(a)	Applicant	petitions for	(a) or (b), as r an extensi (a)-(d) for the	applicable) on of time under 3° total number of month	7 C.F.	R. 1.136 ked below:)
Exte	nsion for re	esponse with	in:		Other than small entity Fee		all entity Fee if applicable)
		fin	st month		\$ 120.00	\$	60.00
		☐ se	cond month		\$ 450.00	\$ 2	225.00
		☐ th	ird month		\$ 1,020.00	\$ 5	510.00
		☐ fo	urth month		\$ 1,590.00	\$ 7	795.00
fifth month					\$ 2,160.00	\$1,	080.00
					Fee Due	\$	
therefor \$ is deducted from the total fee due for the total months of extension now requested. Extension fee due with this request \$ OR (b) Applicant believes that no extension of term is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition for extension of time.							
FEE FOR CLAIMS 4. The fee for claims (37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)-(d)) has been calculated as shown below: OTHER THAN (Col. 1) (Col. 2) (Col. 3) SMALL ENTITY SMALL ENTITY							
	CLAIMS REMAININ AFTER AMENDME	NG	HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	ADDITIONAL. RATE FEE	OR	ADDITIONAL RATE FEE
TOTAL		MINUS		=0	x \$25.00 = \$		x \$50.00 = \$
INDEP.		MINUS		=0	x \$100.00 = \$		x \$200.00 = \$
_	FIRST PRI	ESENTATION OF	MULTIPLE DEP. (CLAIM	+\$180.00 = \$		+\$360.00 = \$
L					TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE \$	OR	TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE \$

	(a)	No additional fee for Claims is required							
OR									
	(b)	Total additional fee for claims required §							
FEE PAYMENT									
5.	Attached is a check in the sum of \$								
	Charge Deposit Account No. 01-2384 the sum of \$ A duplicate of this transmittal is attached.								
FEE DEFICIENCY									
6.		If any additional extension and/or fee is required, charge Deposit Account No. 01-2384.							
AND/OR									
		If any additional fee for claims is required, charge Deposit Account No. 01-2384.							
7.		Other:							
		Daniel M. Fitzgerald Reg. No. 38,880 ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600 St. Louis, MO 63102							

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Mark Anthony Juneau

Art Unit: 2125

Serial No.: 09/833,823

Examiner: Carlos R. Ortiz Rodriguez

Filed: April 12, 2001

:

For:

METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR THE EVALUATION OF POWER GENERATING

FACILITIES

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment Hon. Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Office Action mailed September 21, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks have been submitted in consequence thereof. In response to the election requirement set forth in the Office Action, Applicant elects, with traverse, for prosecution in this application all claims of Group I as identified in the Office Action. Claims 1-13, 28-33, 35-42, 43-51, 52-73, and 78-83 are in the elected claim group. According to the Office Action, Claims 1-13, 28-33, 35-42, 43-51, 52-73, and 78-83 are drawn to "recommending a power generating facility to a business entity".

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement imposed under 35 U.S.C. § 121 is respectfully requested. The restriction requirement is traversed because the inventions set out by the claims in Groups I, II and III are clearly related. Applicant submits that a thorough search and examination of any of these claim groups would be relevant to the examination of the other groups and would not be a serious burden on the Examiner. Because a thorough search and examination of any of these claim groups would be relevant to the examination of the other groups, the assertion that the claim groups have acquired a separate status in the art because of